



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/468,437	06/06/95	HODA	T 3408/589

SIDLEY & AUSTIN
4500 RENAISSANCE TOWER
1201 ELM STREET
DALLAS TX 75270-2197

LM11/0216

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, H.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2712

15

DATE MAILED:

03/16/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

See attached

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/468,437

Applicant(s)
Hoda et al

Examiner
Huy Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2712



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 13, 1997

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 20-25 and 31-46 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 20-25 and 31-46 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The proposed drawing correction, filed on Nov 13, 1997 is ☒ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2712

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

2. Claims 20-25, 33, 35, 38-39, and 40-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Orii in view of Sasaki et al and Takahashi.

Regarding claims 20-25, 38, 40-41 and 43-46, Orii discloses a camera apparatus (Fig 1) comprising:

Art Unit: 2712

a camera body (10);

an image device (30,34,46) (column 10, lines 1-68);

first memory (24a) and second memory (26) for storing image information from the image device (column 11 and column 15, lines 1-30);

recording means and reproducing means (50) and (25) for recording and reproducing the image information (column 11 and column 15, lines 1-30);

changing means (33, 108) for changing the recording from first memory to the second memory by copying the image from the first memory to the second memory and for changing the reproducing the first memory to the second memory by stopping the reproducing of the first memory and reproducing the image stored in the second memory to the monitor (27) for viewing (column 12, lines 5-68, column 15, lines 8-28) in accordance with a first condition and a second condition (the selection of the user).

O'rii further teaches that the reproduced from a the memory card can be supplied to to a reproducing device for viewing (column 13, lines 1-5), but fails to specifically teach that the reproduced image information from the first semiconductor and second semiconductor memory is supplied to a reproducing device . However, it is noted supplying the image information from a plurality of storage media to the same reproducing device

Art Unit: 2712

(monitor) in order to provide more convenience to the user when selecting the image information from a storage means for viewing is well known in the art; therefore Official Notice is taken and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the proposed combination apparatus of Orie, Takahashi and Sasaki by supplying the image information from the first semiconductor memory and second semiconductor memory to the monitor (27) in order to provide more convenience to the user in selecting the image information in either first or semiconductor memory for viewing.

Regarding claims 33,35,39 and 42, Orie further teaches a finder (23) for displaying the image.

Orie further teaches that the second memory is a semiconductor memory but fails to teach that the first memory is a semiconductor memory such as a memory card as recited in claims. However, it is noted that employing a semiconductor memory device such as an IC card device which is detachable from a camera unit and the memory of SRAM kind for storing image signals and semiconductor memory reproducing means for reproducing image signals in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus is well known in the art as taught by Sasaki et al (column 7, lines 60-65). Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orie with Sasaki by providing

Art Unit: 2712

the apparatus of Orit with the semiconductor memory of SRAM kind as disclosed by Sasaki et al as an alternate first memory of Orit apparatus in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus.

Orit as modified with Sasaki fails to teach that the second memory is provided in the camera body as recited in claims.

Takahashi teaches a camera apparatus having a plurality of kind of memory which are provided in housing of a camera body in order to provide more convenience to the user when handling the camera (column 9, lines 20-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orit as modified with Sasaki with Takahashi by incorporating the first memory and second memory in the camera body in order to provide more convenience to the user when handling the camera.

3. Claims 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orit in view of Sasaki as applied to claims 20 above, further in view of Finelli.

Orit as modified with Sasaki fails to specifically teach the use of a printer for the camera as recited in claims 34 and 36. However, it is noted that using a printer for making a copy of the image is well known in the art as taught by Finelli (See

Art Unit: 2712

Finelli, Figs. 1 and 3). Therefore, it would obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orii with Finelli by providing a printer as taught by Finelli into the camera apparatus of Orii in order to provide a copy of select image to the user.

4. Claims 31 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki et al.

Lang discloses an editing apparatus for comprising:

a first reception unit for receiving a memory (13) (column 6, lines 1-20).

a second reception unit (11) for receiving an optical disc (column 3, lines 58 to column 4, line 16);

signal processing means (26) for expanding the compressed image signal from the memory (column 9, lines 20-30);

recording and reading means for recording and reading the expanded image signal on and from the optical disc (column 3, lines 58-62, column 9, lines 1-68).

Lang further teach that the memory is a semiconductor (SRAM) but fails to teach that the memory is a memory card (column 6, lines 1-20).

However, it is noted that using a memory as a memory card for recording image signal and reception unit to enable the

Art Unit: 2712

memory can be remove from a apparatus is well known in the art as shown by Sasaki.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Sasaki by proving a memory card and a reception unit of the memory card as taught by Sasaki into the apparatus of Lang as an alternate memory of Lang and incorporate a reception unit to enable the memory card can be received and removed from the apparatus in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus and easily replace the memory card.

Further for claim 31, Lang as modified with Sasaki teach that the image information is produced by a camera (image device) (See Lang and Sasaki references).

5. Claim 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Watanabe.

Lang fails to specifically teach that the image signal is compressed in a DCT manner. However, it is noted that expanding a compressed image signal in a DCT manner is well known in the art as shown by Watanabe (Fig. 2, column 5, lines 27-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Watanabe by providing apparatus of Lang with a DCT compressing and expanding as taught by Watanabe to compress

Art Unit: 2712

and expand the image signals in order to improve the quality of the image signal

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed Nov 13, 1997 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 26, in Remarks page 17, applicant argues that Orii fails to teach a changer means for automatically changing a first condition, in which the image output from the image device is stored on the first semiconductor, and a second condition, in which the image from the image device, is stored on the second semiconductor memory. In response, it is submitted that the applicant argument does not reflect the claimed invention since nowhere in claim does it suggests or implies a changer for automatically changing ... as argued by applicants.

In Remarks, page 18, applicant argues that the claimed invention of claim 20 is illustrated as (b). Applicant is requested to point out portions in the drawing and specification which disclose the limitation of claim 20 as illustrated by (b) (See applicant argument in Remarks paper No 10).

In Remarks, page 19, applicant argue that neither Orii, Takahashi and Sasaki would include the teaching or suggestion

Art Unit: 2712

which would enable one of skill in the art to interchange the magnetic tape (Orii) or the optical card or the magnetic disk (Takahashi) with semiconductor of Sasaki. In response, it is submitted that using of a semiconductor memory (memory card) as alternative storage medium for storing the image data in order to reduce the size of the apparatus is well recognized in the art ; therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a memory card as an alternative storage medium for a magnetic tape of Orii in order to reduce the size of the apparatus.

In Remarks, page 20, applicant argues that no one of Orii reproduction device can receive image information output from both a first memory and a second memory. In response , it is noted using a reproducing device (monitor for reproducing the recorded image information for viewing is well known in the art therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to supply the reproduced image information from the first semiconductor memory to the monitor which supply with the reproduced image information from second semiconductor for selectively viewing .

In Remarks page 22, applicant argue that Lang as modified with Sasaki fails to teach a means for restoring the image information . In response, it is submitted that the proposed

Art Unit: 2712

combination of Lang and Sasaki does teach a restoring means (expanding means) for restoring the compressed image information from the first memory card and recording the restored image information on the optical disk (See Lang column 3, lines 58-62, column 9, lines 1-68).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dunlap discloses an apparatus recording/reproducing apparatus having a plurality of storage media for supplying image information to the same reproduction device (monitor).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is

Art Unit: 2712

not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Serial Number: 08/468,437

Page 12

Art Unit: 2712

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5399, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


PRIMARY EXAMINER

H.N

March 1, 1998